REMARKS

Claims 4-9, 15-21, and 31-47 have been examined. Claims 40 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, claims 35, 36, 39, 40, 46, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and claims 4-9, 15-21 and 31-34 stand rejected on prior art grounds.

Applicants hereby cancel claim 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, claims 4-9, 15-19, 21, and 31-47 are all the claims pending in the application

Statement of Substance of Interview

Applicants' representative, Sean M. Conner, conducted telephonic interviews with Examiner Ajay Bhatia on May 29, 2009 and June 9, 2009. Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interviews.

In view of the helpful comments by the Examiner, Applicants amend claims 4, 15, 35, 37, 39-41, 46, and 47 in order to expedite prosecution. As discussed below, the cited art of record does not teach or suggest at least the newly added features of these claims. In the interview, the Examiner acknowledged that the prior art rejections are overcome in view of the amendments. Additionally, Applicants submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 101.

No exhibits or demonstrations were provided and no amendments were proposed by Applicants' representative.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 40 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In support of the rejections, the Examiner asserts that:

> "Claims 40 and 47 recites the limitation 'tangibly embodied computer readable medium of instructions' in first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The specification fails to define a 'tangibly embodied computer readable medium of instructions.'" (See page 2 of the Office Action)

Applicants hereby amend claims 40 and 47 to recite:

> "A ~~tangibly embodied~~ computer readable medium ~~of~~ having embodied thereon program instructions suitable for execution by a computer…"

Applicants submit that the disclosure, as originally filed, supports the above recitations. Specifically, original filed claims 14 and 29 recited a computer readable medium of instructions. Furthermore, the last paragraph on page 9 indicates that the link correction and checking services of the present invention may be implemented in software with program instructions executed on a computer. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 40 and 47 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 40 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, The Examiner asserts that a "medium of instructions" is software and is not an article of manufacture. Applicants amend claims 40 and 47 to recite a computer readable medium having embodied thereon program instructions. Applicants submit that such a computer readable medium is hardware and respectfully submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the claimed system does not recite hardware. Applicants amend claim 35 to recite a remote web server comprising a link checking service unit, and a local web server comprising a link correction service unit. Applicants submit that the claimed servers are hardware which implement the claimed units (See at least page 1, line 13 to page 2, line 10; and page 9, line 18 to page 10, line 4 of the specification).

Claims 39 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In support of the rejection, the Examiner asserts that the claims make use of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph, means plus function terminology, but the means defined in the specification are software means. Applicants hereby amend claims 39 and 46 to recite a processor. Because a processor is hardware, Applicants submit that the claims comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-9, 15-21 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,578,078 to Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith") in view of United States Patent No. 5,761,683 to Logan et al. (hereinafter "Logan"). Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

In framing the rejection of claim 4, the Examiner asserts that Smith teaches many of the features of the claim, but correctly acknowledges that Smith does not teach any action performed by referring to a mapping table stored on the remote server, wherein the mapping table stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server (page 5 of the Office Action).

The Examiner asserts that Logan teaches the above features and cites col. 20, lines 23-65 and Figure 13 of Logan in support of this assertion.

Logan is directed to a method in which a user activates a link to generate a URL request specifying a remote file. If it is determined that a copy of the remote file is stored locally at a local URL, then the request is redirected to the local copy. In order to make such a determination, a search is performed in for the remote URL in a lookup table. If the lookup table stores the remote URL, a corresponding local URL is also stored which specifies the local copy (col. 20, lines 24-37). During idle time, the integrity of the local copies specified by the local URLs in the lookup table are verified against the original remote files. That is, it is determined whether the original remote file has been modified, and if so, the modified file on the remote server is copied and stored locally at the local URL (col. 20, lines 67).

Initially, Applicants note that Logan discloses that the lookup table is stored on the *local* server (col. 19, lines 9-14). Thus, Logan doesn't teach or suggest a mapping table stored on the *remote* server which stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, as recited by claim 4.

Moreover, Logan's lookup table records a relationship between a remote URL specifying a remote file and a local URL specifying a copy of the remote file. Logan's lookup table does not store changes that occur *in locations of resources* on the remote server, as recited by the independent claims. At best, Logan's lookup table reflects changes in content of the files to which the URLs point.

In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 4 to recite that the mapping table indicates changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server by storing prior

locations of the resources on the remote server, status codes indicating a status of the prior locations, and new locations of the resources on the remote server. Contrary to the above features, Logan discloses a lookup table which stores a current location of a file on a remote server in association with a current location of a copy of the remote file on a local server. Smith does not cure this deficiency of Logan.

Applicants further amend claim 4 to recite

> "wherein a status code stored in the mapping table in association with the first resource comprises one of a first status code that indicates that the first resource has moved from a prior location stored in the mapping table in association with the first resource to a new location stored in the mapping table in association with the first resource, and a second status code that indicates that the first resource has been permanently removed from the remote server, and
>
> wherein a status code stored in the mapping table in association with the second resource comprises a third status code which indicates that the second resource is located at a prior location stored in the mapping table in association with the second resource."

Logan does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 4. Indeed, Logan is silent about various status codes which provide indications about the stored location of a resource on the remote server. Smith does not cure this deficiency of Logan. During the interview, the Examiner acknowledged this point.

Because Smith does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 4, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Smith. Applicants further submit that claims 5-9, 31, and 33 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 4.

Independent claim 15, as amended, recites a mapping table stored on a remote server which indicates changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server by storing prior locations of the resources on the remote server, status codes indicating a status of the prior locations, and new locations of the resources on the remote server

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 4, Logan discloses that the lookup table is stored on the *local* server (col. 19, lines 9-14). Thus, Logan doesn't teach or suggest a mapping table stored on the *remote* server which stores changes that occur in locations of resources on the remote server, as recited by claim 15.

Moreover, Logan's lookup table records a relationship between a remote URL specifying a remote file and a local URL specifying a copy of the remote file. Logan's lookup table does not store changes that occur *in locations of resources* on the remote server, as recited by claim 15. At best, Logan's lookup table reflects changes in content of the files to which the URLs point.

Independent claim 15, as amended, further recites:

> "wherein a status code stored in the mapping table in association with the first resource comprises a first status code that indicates that the first resource has moved from the location indicated by the first location indicator to the alternate location of the first resource, the location indicated by the first location indicator and the alternate location of the first resource being stored in the mapping table in association with the first resource, and
>
> wherein a status code stored in the mapping table in association with the second resource comprises one of a second status code that indicates that the second resource has been permanently removed from the remote server, and a third status code which indicates that the second resource is located at a location indicated by the second location indicator which is stored in the mapping table in association with the second resource."

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 4, Logan is silent about various status codes which provide indications about the stored location of a resource on the remote server. Thus, Logan does not teach or suggest the above features of claim 15. Smith does not cure these deficiencies of Logan.

Because Smith does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 15, Applicants submit that the claim is not anticipated by Smith. Applicants further submit that claims 16-19, 21, 32, and 34 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 15.

Independent claims 35, 37, 39, and 40 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 35, 37, 39, and 40 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 4. Applicants further submit that claims 36 and 38 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 35 and 37, respectively.

Independent claims 41, 46, and 47 recite features similar to those discussed above in conjunction with claim 15. Accordingly Applicants submit that claims 41, 46, and 47 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above with respect to claim 15. Applicants further submit that claims 42-45 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 41.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean M. Conner/
Sean M. Conner
Registration No. 60,840

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133
46159
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 30, 2009